

Remarks & Arguments

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1-21 are pending in the application, and that Claims 1-21 are rejected. By this amendment, Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended. Thus, Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. The amendments to the claims do not add new matter to the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Claims 1-2 and 8-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combined teachings of Kadyk et. al. (6,674,767) and Joseph (6,038,603). With regard to independent Claims 1 and 8, the rejection alleges that Kadyk teaches a method of transferring data from handheld devices comprising the steps of: a) forwarding information to an exchange manager (gateway 240), said information having associated therewith a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) string (address 281 might be the specific URL), said step a) performed by an application resident on said handheld device (Kadyk, Fig 2, C6: L44-66 and C5, L33-65); b) in response to said identified transport mechanism of said URL, said exchange manager referencing an exchange library (network driver library 426) associated with said identified transport mechanism from a plurality of exchange libraries (e.g., device driver library 414, encryption module library 418, network driver library 426, etc.) wherein said exchange library defines a communication protocol for said identified transport mechanism and wherein said exchange manager supports a plurality of communication protocols (Kadyk, C10:L42-57, C13: L19-33 and C14: L17-58); and c) communicating said information to a system, identified by said destination,

that is external to said handheld device using said communication protocol, said step c) performed by said identified transport mechanism, (i.e., by some appropriate protocol) (Kadyk, C2: L36-41 and L62-67, C3: L1-35, C4: L19-31, C9: L25-67 and C14: L44-58).

The rejection correctly notes that Kadyk does not teach or suggest the URL containing an identified transport mechanism for communication said information and also a destination for said information. Applicant also respectfully asserts that the gateway (see Kadyk at Fig. 4; C9, L24-67; and C10, L36 to C14, L43) disclosed in Kadyk is not equivalent to the Exchange Manager (Figs 8-11; P25, L8 to P34, L11). For example, the gateway of Kadyk is separate and distinct from the sending and/or receiving device (e.g., handheld device). Furthermore, Kadyk teaches that the gateway converts the message (e.g., information) from a first format to a second format. As claimed in Claims 1 and 8, the Exchange Manager does not convert the information. Instead the information is received from an application in the handheld device and communicated to a system external to the handheld device (see step c). The destination and protocol utilized in communicating the information is provided by the Exchange Manager (see steps a and b). Kadyk also discloses that the gateway converts the message from one protocol to another. The Exchange Manager, on the other hand, causes the information to be communicated by the protocol according to a transport mechanism contained in a URL associated with the information.

In addition, the rejection acknowledges that Joseph does not teach or suggest: a) forwarding information from an application on said handheld device to an exchange manager on said handheld device, said information having associated therewith a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) string ..., said step a) performed by an application resident on said handheld device; b) in response to said identified transport mechanism of said URL, said exchange manager referencing an exchange library associated with said identified transport mechanism from a plurality of exchange libraries, wherein said exchange library defines a communication protocol for said identified transport mechanism and wherein said exchange manager supports a plurality of communication protocols; and c) communicating said information to a system, identified by said destination, that is external to said handheld device using said communication protocol, said step c) performed by said identified transport mechanism. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 8 are patentable over the combination of Kadyk and Joseph.

Claims 2-7 and 9-14 are dependent upon Claims 1 and 8, respectively, and include all the limitations therein. Therefore Claims 2-7 and 9-14 are patentable over Kadyk and Joseph for the reasons advanced in support of Claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-14 is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being anticipated in view of the combination of Kadyk, Joseph, Bodnar et al. (6,295,541) and Skarbo et al. (6,317,777). With regard to Claim 15, the rejection alleges that Kadyk and Joseph discloses the method for

transferring/retrieving data as in Claim 1, but does not explicitly teach storing said file/information in memory and associating said file with a data set associated with said application. Applicant respectfully asserts that the gateway (see Kadyk at Fig. 4; C9, L24-67; and C10, L36 to C14, L43) disclosed in Kadyk is not equivalent to the Exchange Manager (Figs 8-11; P25, L8 to P34, L11). For example, gateway of Kadyk is separate and distinct from the sending and/or receiving device (e.g., handheld device). Furthermore, Kadyk teaches that the gateway converts the message (e.g., information) from a first format to a second format. As claimed in Claims 1 and 8, the Exchange Manager does not convert the information. Instead the information is received from an application in the handheld device and communicated to a system external to the handheld device (see step c). The destination and protocol utilized in communicating the information is provided by the Exchange Manager (see steps a and b). Kadyk also discloses that the gateway converts the message from one protocol to another. The Exchange Manager, on the other hand, causes the information to be communicated by the protocol according to a transport mechanism contained in a URL associated with the information.

In addition, the rejection implicitly acknowledges that neither Joseph, Bodnar nor Skarbo teach or suggest: a) receiving a file of information over the Internet from a source external to said handheld device and based on a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) string associated with said file, said file having associated therewith a data type, said step a) performed by said handheld device; b) creating a universal stream file of said file, wherein said stream file indicates

a data type of said file; c) in response to said stream file being received, an exchange manager resident on said handheld device identifying an application for said stream file based on said data type of said file and an application registry; d) said application resident on said handheld device converting a data format of said file to a format specific to said application; and d) storing said file in memory and associating said file with a dataset associated with said application.

Accordingly, Claim 15 is patentable over the combination of Kadyk, Joseph, Bodnar and Skarbo.

Claims 16-21 are dependent upon Claim 15, and include all the limitations therein. Therefore Claims 16-21 are patentable over Kadyk Joseph, Bodnar and Skarbo for the reasons advanced in support of Claim 15. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 15-21 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 23-0085. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a

Appl. No. 09/598,668
Amdt. Dated October 21, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 15, 2004

petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric J. Gash", is written over a horizontal line.

Eric J. Gash
Registration No. 46,274
Tel.: (408) 938-9060

Dated: October 21, 2004